



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/041,591	01/10/2002	Richard D. Heisey	73-96	5219

25542 7590 08/16/2004

CNH AMERICA LLC
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW DEPARTMENT
NEW HOLLAND, PA 17557

EXAMINER

MAMMEN, NATHAN SCOTT

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3671

DATE MAILED: 08/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

E

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/041,591	HEISEY, RICHARD D.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nathan S Mammen	3671	

All Participants:(1) Nathan S Mammen.(2) Brant Maurer.**Status of Application:** final rejection

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 11 August 2004**Time:** 12:00**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

U.S. Patent No. 6,149,546 to Tabata et al.; U.S. Patent No. 5,781,876 to Saur; U.S. Patent No. 6,098,044 to Gryzelius et al.


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Following up a phone conversation with Mr. Maurer on August 5, 2004, the examiner brought the above mentioned prior art to Mr. Maurer's attention. The above prior art appears to be relevant to the claims of the instant invention, and applicant's may wish to consider this prior art when drafting a response to the final office action. Further consideration of the art on the part of the examiner is required..

A handwritten signature, possibly reading "H. M.", followed by the date "8/11/04".